

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

OCTOBER 7, 2013 – 104 GORE HALL

OFFICIAL MINUTES

Members Present: B. Ackerman, L Awad, N. Brickhouse, M. Buell, N. Carver, J Courtright, J. Daniel, P. Dhurjati, N. Donofrio, P. Duker, C. Dybowski, R. Dyer, S. Eidelman, D. Galileo, T. Gill, S. Goodwin, D. Grasso, S. Hansen, B. Hanson, E. Hayes, G. Hermon, F. Hofstetter, J. Jebb, A. Jones, M. Kernan, P. Laux, K. Matt, M. McLane, M. McLeod, D. Miklitz, J. Morgan, J. Morrison, A. Muenchow, J. Mycoff, L. Okagaki, B. Orzada, S. Pollack, D. Reisman, C. Riordan, T. Rocek, D. Satran, B. Settles, E. Selva, S. Shabo, C. Shen, H. Tanner, D Thompson, E. Tranby, K. Turkell, T. Vermeer, B. Weber, C. Williams, L. Winn, R. Wisser, R. Wool

Members Excused: T. Angell, L. Claessens, D. Ford, M. Gaffney, S. Isenstadt, B. Ogunnaike, V. Perez, M. Rieger, N. Targett, G. Watson

Members Absent: R. Cole, A. Donovan, J. Gillespie, S. McGear, P. Penix-Tadsen

September 26, 2013

TO: Senators and Executives

FROM: Martha Buell, Vice President
University Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Regular Faculty Senate and General Faculty Meeting October 7, 2013

In accordance with Section IV, paragraph 6 of the Constitution, the regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on the Monday, October 7th at 4:00 p.m. in room 104 Gore Hall.

I certify that hard copies of the approval page for each undergraduate and graduate studies academic item on the agenda are filed in the Faculty Senate Office with the appropriate signatures of approval up through the Chair of the Faculty Senate Coordinating Committee on Education. The Agenda will be as follows:

AGENDA

I. Adoption of the Agenda

Agenda was adopted unanimously

II. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes were approved unanimously

III. Remarks: Provost Domenico Grasso

Provost Grasso made three brief announcements:

- A review of the RBB process will be launched. Nancy Brickhouse and Donald Sparks will lead the review committee. The committee consists of a team of administrators and one faculty.
- VP of Student Life, Michael Gilbert left a few months ago for UConn. An ad hoc committee examined whether we could combine VP of Student Life and VP of Enrollment Management. The answer was to keep the two positions separate.
- Tag line “Dare to be First” has been controversial...many don't like it and felt marketing foisted it on them. He enjoys “dare to be first” and thinks it means we're a university that is not afraid to lead the way. He said “the sentiment is one we all share in being leaders in our particular profession.”

IV. Announcements: Senate President Deni Galileo

See attached slides for details ([attachment](#))

Announcements

- Parliamentary procedures posted
- Points of information
 - Non-credit certificates: senate voted to require all these programs to be approved by the senate coordinating committee on education (CCE). The CCE has developed an online form to facilitate this and will be distributed and posted on the senate website.
 - Collective bargaining agreement has letters of understanding to create two new joint committees; committees will consider conditions of employment for CNTT faculty and faculty

representation in searches for academic administrators. Neither committee has met yet.

Jose Aviles, Director of Admissions

See attached slides for details of the talk ([attachment](#))

- 2012-2013 Recruitment Successes, Demographic trends – enrollment landscape
 - 3rd largest applicant pool in UD history with 26200 applicants, 24% identify themselves as students of color or international, 47 states and 79 countries, largest number of honors applications, even though we attracted the largest number of honors students we slipped 2%, however, yield did not meet all targets.
 - High School graduates peaked in 2011 and from 2013-2014 High School graduates will decline slowly, Northeast has highest concentration of colleges presenting a period of heated competition
 - Trends in preparation...SAT scores hit a four decade low in 2012 and remained flat for 2013 (less English speaking students take it, bigger gap in minorities, score increases with family income of over 20000), ACT reported lowest composite average of 5, remedial course participation has increased overall. The positive news is 2013 NAEP scores show a closing of the achievement gap between scores of ethnic minorities (more ACT takers this year than SAT)
- His goal: craft a high quality and diverse entering class reflective of society as a whole → have to be interested and engaged and look for the most highly qualified students in a region
- Path forwards
 - Increase/enhance competitiveness focusing on students with an 1800+ SAT
 - Destination of choice for diverse students
 - Domestic expansion
 - International expansion
 - Transfers
 - Not ready to grow or decrease this population, want to look at how they serve us and how we serve them, asked how we can protect our freshman profile
- “The status quo is no longer sustainable” quoted from WICHE report, will require a community effort in trying to manage enrollment through this next decade

V. Item For Information: RBB Report

- Report of Ad Hoc RBB Committee by Jim Morrison (chair) and Prasad Dhurjati (committee member)

- Jim Morrison gave an overview of the report on the impact of RBB on academic mission and faculty governance
- RBB (responsibility based budgeting)
- Original intent was to support achievement of highest academic priorities, decentralize decision making, aligns accountability for revenues and expenses, decision makers awarded
- Two different surveys (for faculty and chairs/directors) were distributed: 486 faculty members completed the survey, 39 chairs/unit directors also completed it
- Total budget 987.5M, but we are only concerned with money that flows to colleges which is about 500M (reason for the difference is bookstores, dorms, dining services, direct costs of contracts and grants, etc. which is considered to be restricted funds). Approximately 33.5 M of the 500M is set aside for capital projects, executive units, strategic initiatives, etc., leaving about \$466M to split into seven different college revenue pies. Instead of having one University budget as was the case prior to RBB, one now has seven different college budgets to balance which is the primary difference between the old system and RBB
- Need rules to allocate like the revenue into 7 pies, colleges don't see state money or endowment directly, they see a different pie, research carries over so does undergrad tuition, (140M is set aside for central distribution, Colleges earn money based on number of courses taught and number of majors they have)
- Need rules also to allocate common expenses. Assigned costs like library, utilities, campus security (e.g. if a college has more space they pay more utilities per square footage or if a college has more "head-count", they pay more for the library)
- Academic Impact: Many impacts on academics at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Impacts at the undergraduate level included increased number of courses, increased class size has gone up, decreased number of course sections. Committee not sure if what's happening is good or bad, want to make sure enough sections are offered so students can graduate on time and want size small enough so there's a lot of interaction
- Conclusions
 - RBB is not truly decentralized, counter to its original intent
 - Very little carry through to the department level in terms of making decisions related to allocation of resources
 - Non funded research totally ignored
 - Money for college budgets allocated after other university expenses actually paid
 - No incentives exist in regard to teaching based
- Recommendations
 - Greater decentralization of incentive structure in RBB
 - Additional transparency of budget system for faculty

- Re-examination of research incentives and current subvention process
- Initiation of incentives for teaching and service, and for enhancing university flagship programs
- Reconstitute faculty senate standing budget committee
- Ensure academic program development systems are not unduly influenced by the budget model (money driving decisions rather than academic quality...need a balance)

VI. Consent Agenda

A. Announcements for Challenge: None

VII. Regular Agenda

1. Resolutions:

- a. Recommendation from the Ad Hoc RBB Committee (Jim Morrison, Chair) with the concurrence of the Committee on Rules (Prasad Dhurjati, Chair), the Committee on Committees and Nominations (Brian Hanson, Chair) and the Executive Committee (Deni Galileo, Chair) for the request to **establish a Standing University Faculty Senate Budget Committee** ([attachment 1](#)) ([attachment](#))

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate *Ad Hoc* Committee on RBB has met numerous times and has issued its report to the Senate with recommendations, which include the reconstitution of a standing Senate Budget Committee; and

WHEREAS, it would be beneficial in many ways to the University of Delaware to have a high degree of transparency of the budgetary processes of the University as a whole and of the academic units within it; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate should have a formal mechanism to give timely advice to the administration of the University about how potential budgetary decisions will influence the many academic and research endeavors of the University; and

WHEREAS, other excellent universities maintain University Budget Committees with substantial faculty representation, which advise their administrations about budgetary issues; be it therefore,

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate shall establish a standing University Faculty Senate Budget Committee, with representation by faculty from each of its colleges, charged with the responsibilities of

- 1) becoming fully informed on the financial and planning issues of this University. Specifically, it shall examine University budgets, financial statements and other related documents used in developing budgetary plans. The committee may receive confidential information, and must respect the confidentiality of this information.
- 2) reviewing and providing timely prospective advice, prior to finalizing budget turnaround decisions, concerning the University's annual budgets, the processes used to determine them, and their potential impact on the academic, research and outreach missions of the University to the President, Provost, Deans and other officers of administration with responsibility for the University's annual budgets.
- 3) communicating information about the University's annual budgets and their potential impact on academic programs to the University Faculty Senate and to the University Faculty as a whole.

This committee is authorized to confer with other Senate committees and with University budget personnel as appropriate.

The Committee shall consist of seven faculty members (one from each College), the majority of whom shall be tenured. The Committee on Committees and Nominations shall appoint the faculty members for this committee for terms of three years. Appointments shall be scheduled such that the faculty member's terms will expire in a staggered manner. The Committee on Committees and Nominations shall appoint annually the chairperson from the seven faculty members. An eighth member of the committee shall be appointed annually by the Provost as his or

her designee, and this member shall serve to facilitate interactions between the committee and relevant administrative offices.

A motion was made by Deputy Provost Nancy Brickhouse to postpone the discussion of the resolution until after the open meeting on RBB on October 28th. 26 senators voted in favor of postponing, 18 voted against postponing, and there was 1 abstention. Motion to postpone the discussion on the resolution until after the Oct. 28 meeting PASSES

- b. Recommendation from the Committee on Graduate Studies (Charles Swanik, Chair) with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (Fred Hofstetter, Chair) and the Executive Committee (Deni Galileo, Chair) for the request to approve the **MA Speech Language Pathology Program** ([attachment](#)) ([attachment](#)) ([attachment resolution approving curriculum](#)) ([revised budget attachment](#)) ([attachment](#))

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2013 the Faculty Senate approved the curriculum for a new M.A. in speech-language pathology but postponed the establishment of the program until “likely sources and amounts of full financial support for the first several years of operation of this program have been specified by the Dean of the College of Health Sciences,” and

WHEREAS, the College of Health Sciences has received an allocation of \$1MM from the Delaware state legislature over FY13 and FY14 for planning and establishing this program, and

WHEREAS, the Offices of the Provost and University Budget have affirmed that the speech-language pathology program will be resource neutral with respect to other colleges, and

WHEREAS, the proposed program will contribute to the University's "Path to Prominence" goal to become a premier research and graduate university; be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends provisional approval for five years following program launch of

the establishment of a new M.A. in Speech-Language Pathology.

During the discussion of the Speech Language Pathology proposal, questions were raised on the sources of funding, the expected growth in faculty numbers and the rank at which faculty would be hired. The answers were that a major source of funding would be from the State and that there would be new hires at various ranks including a founding director of the program. A Senator stated that they have a well-established undergraduate program that prepares students to go to an MA program like this. The Senator questioned whether there was sufficient faculty involvement in the development of the new program, in particular given its overlap with other existing academic programs. Other administrators countered by stating that there was an attempt to be as inclusive as possible. Andrew Teplyakov, Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee stated that their committee fully supported the program purely on its merits. If the program were not sustainable in five to eight years, it would be disestablished or re-discussed.

Motion Passes with 38 in favor, none against and 3 abstentions.

- c. Recommendation from the Committee on Graduate Studies (Charles Swanik, Chair) with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (Fred Hofstetter, Chair) and the Executive Committee (Deni Galileo, Chair) for the request to **grant permanent approval of the PhD in Preservation Studies** ([attachment](#)) ([attachment](#)) ([attachment](#))

WHEREAS, a need for a Doctor of Philosophy with an interdisciplinary major in Preservation Studies was identified in a study conducted by a committee comprised of twelve faculty members and administrators from nine different departments at the University of Delaware from which this program was first proposed in 2004; and

WHEREAS, only three other programs offering degrees in conservation research at the doctoral level similar to the interdisciplinary content of this proposed program are known to exist in the world with only one other in North America; and

WHEREAS, the chairs or other faculty members of the Departments of Anthropology, Art History, Chemistry, the Disaster Research Center and Sociology, Urban Affairs and Public Policy, the Winterthur Program in American Material Culture and the History Department, the Center for Historic Architecture and Design, and the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office all provided letters of support based on their observations of the program and its students; and

WHEREAS, this program has been in existence since 2006, has matriculated eleven students; three have received the Ph.D.; and

WHEREAS, the Doctor of Philosophy in Preservation Studies has now met all the requirements for permanent status; be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Doctor of Philosophy in Preservation Studies become a permanent doctoral-level program at the University of Delaware.

Resolution passed unanimously

2. Unfinished Business: None

3. New Business: None

VIII. Introduction of New Business

Such items as may come before the Senate. (No motion introduced under new business, except a motion to refer to committee, shall be acted upon until the next meeting of the Senate.)